

## **Remarks**

As stated above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and request reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Currently, Claims 1-41 are pending in the subject application, of which claims 1, 15, 25, and 34 are independent claims.

In regard to Item 11, the Examiner objects to the title of the application for lack of specificity. Applicants have amended the title consistent with the Examiner's suggested title. The title now reads: "BUSINESS SOFTWARE APPLICATION FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A COMPOSITE APPLICATION." Withdrawal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein.

In regard to Item 12, the Examiner objects to the specification as containing various informalities. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the use of trademarks without including a trademark symbol. Applicants have amended the specification to designate trademarks with the appropriate symbol. Applicants have also amended the specification throughout to correct grammatical and typographical errors. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by any of these amendments. Withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein.

In regard to Item 13, the Examiner objects to claims 27 and 29-33 due to typographical errors. Applicants have amended claims 27 and 29-33 to correct the typographical errors. No new matter is believed entered by these amendments. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

In regard to Item 15, the Examiner rejects claims 32 and 33 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the claims recite the limitation "the business object." Applicants have amended claim 32 to remove the term "the business object" and replace it with "a business object" as the Examiner suggested. Claim 33 continues to recite "the business object" but, since claim 33 is dependant upon claim 32, it refers to the business object of claim 32 and is not indefinite. Applicants believe, with this correction, claims 32 and 33 are now definite under § 112 and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In regard to Item 17, the Examiner rejects claims 1-14 and 25-41 as non-statutory under 35 USC § 101. Specifically, the Examiner states that the claims "lack the necessary physical components to ... constitute a machine under § 101" Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 25, and 34 to include the necessary physical components so that the claims recite statutory subject matter under § 101. Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to recite, in relevant part, "[a] system comprising a computer program product residing on a computer readable medium having a plurality of instructions stored thereon which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations," and/or "[a] computer program product residing on a computer readable medium having a plurality of instructions stored thereon which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operation." Applicants believe these claims, as amended, are directed at statutory subject matter under § 101 and are consistent with the holding in *In re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Applicants have also amended dependant claims 2-14, 35-33, and 35-31 to reflect the changes in claims 1, 25, and 34. The Applicants believe no new matter is entered by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1-14 and 24-41 and 34 are directed at patentable subject matter under § 101 and requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of the claims as non-statutory.

In regard to Item 19, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-26, 28 and 30-33 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Burke et al. (US 6,789,252; hereinafter Burke).

In regard to claim 1, Applicants have amended claim 1 to further recite "a metadata repository operable to provide metadata for at least one of: business objects, business processes, user interfaces, business services, and code templates." (See generally Applicants' specification paragraphs 69-70; Applicants' figure 2 item 240; Applicants' figure 3 item 360). Applicants respectfully submit that Burke is not understood to disclose, or even suggest, the claimed metadata repository. In light of this amendment to claim 1, Applicants believe that independent claim 1 is patentable over Burke. Applicants further submit that claims 2-3 and 5-13 are patentable over Burke because they are either directly or indirectly dependant on claim 1.

In regard to claim 15, Burke discloses "[a] Business Wizard can be used to create a new business application function using the business object definition system." Burke (col 52 lines 66-67). In contrast, claim 15 recites "generating executable code for a composite application." Nowhere does Burke teach or suggest an the generation of executable code. The "Wizard" disclosed by Burke is a term of art that consists of a user interface that leads a user through a series of steps. As such, a "Wizard" is not understood to be directed toward generation of executable code. Further, a "business application function" as disclosed by Burke is not understood to be directed toward a software function or software code. Rather, a "business application function" is understood to be a business-related function such as an engineering change order, document approval, or order management. (Burke, col 52 lines 65-67, col 53 lines 1-7). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is not anticipated by Burke, in that Burke fails to teach, or even suggest, each and every element of the invention. Furthermore, claims 16, 18, 19, and 21-24 are also patentable because they are either directly or indirectly

dependant upon claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 15 and dependant claims 16, 18, 19, and 21-24.

Independent claim 25 is also not anticipated by Burke. Similar to claim 15, claim 25 recites "generat[ing] executable code for a composite application." Burke does not disclose the generation of code, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is patentable over Burke because Burke fails to teach, or even suggest, each and every element of the claimed invention. Further, claims 26, 28, and 30-33 are believed to be patentable because they are either directly or indirectly dependant upon claim 25. Applicants believe that the differences between claim 25 and the disclosure of Burke demonstrate that the claims are not anticipated by Burke. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 25 and dependant claims 26, 28, and 30-33.

In regard to Item 21, the Examiner rejects claims 4, 20, 29, 34-36, and 38-41 as obvious under 35 USC § 103(a) over the teachings of Burke and Mukundan.

Claim 4 is ultimately dependant upon claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 has been amended, in relevant part, to further recite "a metadata repository operable to provide metadata for at least one of: business objects, business processes, user interfaces, business services, and code templates." As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Burke fails to teach, or even suggest this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that Mukundan fails to remedy the deficiencies of Burke. Particularly, Mukundan also fails to disclose "a metadata repository operable to provide metadata for at least one of: business objects, business processes, user interfaces, business services, and code templates," as recited by amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 4 as obvious over Burke and Mukundan.

Claim 20 is dependant upon claim 15. As discussed above, claim 15 recites, in part, a method including "generating executable code for a composite application." As discussed above, Burke does not disclose a system that generates executable code for a composite application. Mukundan is no help. For example, Munduken discloses: "Writing or modifying application code using a programming language that is compatible with the RPC stubs, so that the application code works with the stubs (block 1225); Generating object code from application code (block 1230)." Mukundan does not disclose generating executable code for a composite application. Rather, as quoted above, the application code in Mukundan is understood to be "[written or modified] ... using a programming language." In this regard, Mukundan implies *manually* generating application code. The invention of independent claim 15 is generally directed at a system that automatically generates application code. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 20.

Claim 29 is dependant upon claim 25 discussed above. Similar to claim 20, and as discussed above, Burke does not disclose a computer program product that generates executable code for a composite application. Additionally, as also discussed above, Mukundan similarly does not disclose the generation of composite application code. As such, the combined teachings of Burke and Mukundan fail to teach or suggest every aspect of independent claim 25, or of claim 29 ultimately depending thereupon. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 34, Applicants have amended claim 34 to further recite a framework including, in part, "a metadata repository operable to provide metadata for at least one of: business objects, business processes, user interfaces, business services, and code templates." Neither Burke nor Mukundan disclose, or even suggest, such a metadata repository. In fact, neither Burke nor Mukundan are understood to disclose either metadata or a metadata repository.

In light of this amendment to claim 34, Applicants believe the claim is non-obvious and patentable over Burke in view of Mukundan. Applicants also believe that claims 35-36 and 38-41 are non-obvious and patentable over Burke in view of Mukundan because they are either directly or indirectly dependant on claim 34. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 34-36 and 38-41 as obvious under 35 USC § 103(a).

In regard to item 22, the Examiner rejects claims 14, 17, and 27 under § 103 as obvious and not patentable over Burke in view of Ireland et al. (US 6,266,666; hereinafter Ireland).

As discussed above, Applicants believe that claim 1, upon which claim 14 ultimately depends, is patentable over Burke because Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the feature of "a metadata repository operable to provide metadata for at least one of: business objects, business processes, user interfaces, business services, and code templates." As discussed above, Burke does not disclose a metadata repository. Ireland is no help in this regard. Although Ireland references metadata in general, Ireland is understood to be directed toward the transmission and synchronization of transactions that include metadata. As such, Ireland does not teach, or even suggest, a metadata repository. In light of amended claim 1, and the above-discussed insufficiencies of the cited references, Applicants believes that claim 14 (which ultimately depends upon claim 1) is patentable over Burke in view of Ireland. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC §103(a).

Regarding claim 17, which ultimately dependents upon claim 15, as discussed above, Applicants believe that claim 15 (and accordingly, dependant claim 17) is patentable over Burke because Burke does not disclose the generation of executable code. Ireland is no help. Although

Ireland discloses a system that synchronizes transactions, Ireland does not disclose a system or method that generates executable code. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claim 17 (which depends upon 15) is patentable over Burke and Ireland because the combined disclosures of Burke and Ireland fail to disclose each and every element of claim 15 and dependant claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC § 103(a).

Regarding claim 27, which is ultimately dependent upon claim 25, as discussed above, Applicants believe that claim 25 (and accordingly, dependant claim 27) is patentable over Burke because Burke does not disclose the generation of executable code. Ireland is no help. Although Ireland discloses a system that synchronizes transactions, Ireland does not disclose a system or method that generates executable code. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claim 27 (ultimately dependant upon claim 25) is patentable over Burke and Ireland because Burke and Ireland fail to disclose each and every element of claim 25 and dependant claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejection of claim 27.

In light of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants respectfully assert that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early allowance of the subject application is respectfully requested.

While the present response is not believed to necessitate any additional fees, if any additional fees are payable, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2324 as necessary.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (@ 617-305-2143) if it is believed that such contact may facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Brian J. Colandreo/

Brian J. Colandreo  
Reg. No. 42,427  
Holland & Knight LLP  
10 St. James Avenue  
Boston, MA 02116-3889  
v. 617-305-2143  
f. 617-523-6850